

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-5, 12 and 13 are allowed. While the Examiner appears to have rejected claims 22-24, Applicant respectfully asserts that the claim limitations recited in claims 22-24 are identical to those in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 22-24 are also allowable.

In addition, claims 6-7 and 10 have been amended to depend from allowable claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 6-8 and 10-11 are also allowable.

In the previous Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 11 and 18-20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, the Examiner has made no such indication in the current Office Action. Applicant notes that a specific rejection of claims 11 and 18-20 could not be found in the current Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11 and 18-20 are also allowable.

Applicant has also amended claim 14 in response to the Examiner's recent objection. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 14-16 and 18-21 are now allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-8, 10, 14-16, and 21-24 under 35 USC 103. The claims have been amended to correct various typographical errors. Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-24 remain pending. Applicant respectfully asserts that each of the pending claims is now allowable.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 21-24 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Basso et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0174879, ('Basso' hereinafter) in view of RFC 2663. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Basso fails to disclose or suggest:
receiving a default route advertised by a network device providing one or more shared services, wherein each of the shared services is available to each of the plurality of virtual private networks; and

updating each of a plurality of sets of routing information (e.g., routing tables) to include the default route to the network device providing one or more shared services available to each of the plurality of virtual private networks.

In fact, Basso fails to disclose or suggest the handling of shared services available to a plurality of virtual private networks in any manner.

The Examiner admits that Basso fails to explicitly show receiving a default route advertised by a network device providing one or more shared services available to each of the virtual private networks; and updating each of the plurality of routing tables to include the default route to the network device providing one or more shared services available to each of the virtual private networks.

The Examiner seeks to cure the deficiencies of Basso with RFC 2663. However, it is important to note that RFC 2663 says nothing about shared services, where each of the shared services is available to each of the virtual private networks. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result.

The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that there is at least one established route advertised by a network device. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Applicant respectfully asserts that RFC 2663 fails to disclose or suggest receiving a default route to a network device providing one or more shared services available to each of the virtual private networks. In fact, Applicant was unable to find any reference in RFC 2663 to shared services that are available to each of the virtual private networks, or the advertising of a default route to such shared services.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that updating a routing table is inherent in NAT. However, Applicant was unable to find a reference in RFC 2663 to updating routing tables associated with all of the VPNs. Since RFC 2663 does not disclose shared services available to each of a plurality of virtual private networks, there would fail to be a need to update tables

associated with each of the VPNs. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a solution to the handling of shared services. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result.

Applicant has amended claim 14 in accordance with the Examiner's objection that the features that were argued were not recited in the rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 14-16 and 18-21 are allowable.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Basso and RFC 2663, and further in view of RFC 2547. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner admits that Basso and RFC 2663 fails to disclose the network device in the public network provides one or more services to each of the virtual private networks. The Examiner seeks to cure the deficiencies of the primary references with RFC 2547.

Applicant respectfully asserts that RFC 2547 fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary references as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claim 8 is patentable over the cited references.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Basso and RFC 2663, and further in view of Kubota et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0142669, ('Kubota' hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Kubota fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 16 is patentable over the cited references.

The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed, as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from

the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a).

SUMMARY

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. CISCP340).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Elise R. Heilbrunn/
Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Tel: (510) 663-1100